

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/628,787	07/28/2003	Slobodan Dan Dimitrijevich	0684CG.034678/DIV	5209	
7590 01/06/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER	
J. Wendy Davis			KOSSON, ROSANNE		
Bracewell & Pa	tterson L.L.P.				
P.O. Box 61389			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Houston, TX 77208-1389			1651		
			DATE MAILED: 01/06/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

7 1	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/628,787	DIMITRIJEVICH, SLOBODAN DAN	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rosanne Kosson	1651	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a		1 1	
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perio - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) did will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS froute, cause the application to become ABANDON	timely filed ays will be considered timely. m the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ Th 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, p		
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9,25 and 27-34 is/are pending in the day of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest signal is/are allowed. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9, 25 and 27-34 are subject to rest	rawn from consideration.	ent.	
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examir 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction. 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	ccepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is c	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents. * See the attached detailed Office action for a list. 	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica iority documents have been recei au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	n□	(DTO 440)	
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informal 6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-9, drawn to an anti-adhesion patch, classified in class 435, subclass 178.
- II. Claims 25 and 27-30, drawn to a method for preventing adhesions between tissues during surgery, classified in class 424, subclass 423.
- III. Claims 31-34, drawn to a method for enhancing wound healing or tissue repair, classified in class 424, subclass 445.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II, and inventions I and III, are related as a product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case, Group I is drawn to a patch comprising collagen and a non-living cellular component, such as collagen type III, V or IX. The product of Group I may used for culturing cells to produce a tissue. As a result, the product of Group I has uses other than in the methods of Groups II and III, and restriction for examination purposes is proper.

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case, the method of Group II is drawn to a method for preventing adhesions between tissues during surgery, while Group III is drawn to a method for enhancing wound healing or tissue repair. Each of these methods recites different steps.

Additionally, this surgical method and this wound healing method clearly have different modes of operation, different functions, and different effects. Thus, restriction for examination purposes is proper.

The search for any one group is not required for the other groups, thereby creating an undue burden of search and examination.

Further, the different groups have each acquired a separate status in the art, as shown by their different classifications.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is clearly proper.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance

Art Unit: 1651

with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Rosanne Kosson whose telephone number is 571-272-2923. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30-6:00, with alternate Mondays off.

Art Unit: 1651

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on 571-272-0926. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 5

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Rosanne Kosson Examiner Art Unit 1651

rk 2004-12-30